

# CLARK COUNTY ANIMAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## MINUTES

CLARK COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER  
500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Commission Chambers  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89121  
August 15, 2013  
6:30 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: DAVIS, RICK (RD)  
GIPAYA, MARY (MG)  
LAYNE, KAREN (KL)  
PRATER, MICHAEL, M.D. (MP)  
WHITE, DEBBIE DVM (DW)  
VALENZUELA, ALMA (AV)

### **1. Call to order**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m

### **2. Approval of agenda**

A motion to approve the agenda was made and seconded

### **3. Approval of August 15, 2013 Minutes**

A motion to approve the minutes was made and seconded.

### **4. Discuss two year and/or staggered terms for the Animal Advisory Committee Members; and take appropriate action.**

KL – we have talked about this for some time. This is based on what Pahrump does. Each year, there is a one-year appointment. Because of the legislature, we had a hard time getting started. We need to talk about having at least two-year terms. We started some things last year. MG fortunately was reappointed but sometimes if the person is not reappointed the progress stops. I think everyone on the Committee except for the student member should have a two-year term. The other suggestion is that we stagger the terms. This year two members were reappointed. I know we have had Committees where everyone was new. Continuity is lost when we do that. MP – continuity would be important. We really didn't get anything done this year. As for the staggered terms, that would help insure continuity. DW feels disoriented coming into this kind of world from what she does every day. As there is a learning curve, it would help to have a two-year term. MG agrees with both of those statements. This is my second year and I feel more comfortable than when I first came in. The staggered terms would allow experienced people to always be on the Committee. That way you are not running blind with everyone new, not knowing what to do. RD – this is really different from what I normally do on a daily basis, certainly a two-year term would be beneficial. AV thinks it would be better for the term to be one year for the student member and thinks a two-year term for the rest of the Committee would be good.

GINA GREISON (GG) agrees. The Pahrump model is good. We need to have multi-year staggered terms so the work can continue. Maybe the student can have the option to be reappointed a second year if they wish to. KL we are voting on the concept not the actual ordinance change. It would be up to Animal Control to set up the actual wording and then the Committee would vote on it so the BCC prior to the appointments for next year might be able to do that.

JANA WRIGHT (JW) works for Commissioner G. The creation of the AAC is part of Title 10 so we need an ordinance change. There is a procedure on how the BCC hears ordinance changes. They have a discussion item to say the AAC would like to extend and stagger the terms. Then they introduce the

ordinance and they have a public hearing so it will take at least 3 meetings once you get a sponsor. I have talked to Commissioner G about this and I think she would do that for the Committee if that is the direction you are going tonight. You might look at the Animal Advisory, Title 10.20.030 for any changes. If we are going to do an ordinance change about the Committee, let's get everything that we need. There are ways to come up with it. We need to be moving if you want this before January 24, 2014. KL – it would be interesting to see what the Commission rules on the kind of people that should be on the Committee. It has been about 5 or 6 years since we added the Equine Member. JW thinks that any suggestions or recommendations need to be vetted by this Committee before you take it to Commissioner G and say this is what they are looking to do. KL we could meet one more time to iron this out so we can present something more structured to the Commissioner to look at. Obviously it is up to them to make that decision but yours is a valid point. If we are going to look at this Committee, then we probably need to look at this Committee. JW – if you just want to fast track the staggered terms, you can do that too.

KL we may want to have one more meeting and take a look at a subcommittee to look at this issue and make a structured presentation that we could vote on at that time. Or we could go forward right now and say that we want to approve two-year terms and staggered appointments to fast track it so we can get it before next year. JW will take a motion to Commissioner G to sponsor the ordinance and CCAC will have to make the ordinance change. RD - motions to have BCC consider two-year and staggered term appointments. Motion approved. KL asked Lt. DAWN STOCKMAN (DS) if she can move forward with this. DS will have something typed up next week. KL maybe JW can run with it as well from that standpoint and see if we can move forward on that. I am concerned that we will not be able to get it through. I urge all of you to seek another appointment.

**5. Receive a report from the Humane/Rescue Group subcommittee; and take appropriate action.**

This Committee has not met since last year so I don't think there is anyone among us who was on that subcommittee. Does anyone have a problem with us going forward to the next item? Committee – no.

**6. Discuss Strategic Plan to End Pet Overpopulation and The Golden Standard and receive input prior to forwarding to the Board of County Commissioners and take appropriate action.**

When the Committee came on board this year, we had a discussion about this agenda item. The Humane Subcommittee consisted of a number of humane rescue groups that had come together in the summer of 2012 and had taken a lot of time over a period of three months to come up with both the Strategic Plan in terms of looking at the overpopulation and as a part of the Gold Standards for rescues. The Committee from 2012 approved them and voted to send them to the BCC. Because a lot of things went on this year, these never went to the BCC and now the effort is underway to send them to the BCC but it would be helpful to have this Committee, since you didn't approve the Standards or the Strategic Plan, to take that action so we can move forward once again with this proposal. Is this something you would be willing to do tonight?

MG yes with a couple exceptions regarding equestrians. The section regarding the microchipping, brand inspections are required for livestock that are transferred in the State of NV so it is not a common practice in the equestrian community because registration, transfers, animal brands is through the State. I don't know that the microchip would be a necessary item. We already have a state law in place for transfers of livestock that does include horses so maybe we can exclude equine. KL – you are talking about the Gold Standards Item 2. MG yes for equestrian rescue groups. KL – the state statute in this instance would take precedence. As they stand, we would like to have the rescues adopt the Gold Standards. Some of these are already in the ordinance and other portions such as microchips would be put in Title 10. By adopting the Gold Standards, we are agreeing in purpose but not putting it in ordinance. The DA's office would have to review these before anything is done. Since there is already something for horses, they would not need to

be microchipped. DW we have to watch, as there are hamsters, guinea pigs that I don't believe are being altered. MG - horses are being gelded but a horse spay is not usually done. KL – where Title 10 talks about s/n requirements they only apply to certain animals. Based on that, we only deal with the animals that are now required to be s/n under Title 10 and these requirements are for those animals. The animal population in the valley right now is concentrated in dogs and cats. Do we have problems with exotics or the other category? Probably, but our biggest population problem is with the dogs and cats, pot bellied pigs and ferrets. Maybe we need to recognize that these only apply to those animals that already must be s/n under Title 10. MG - I assumed it was cats and dogs but it said all rescue groups so we should make it a little more specific so we are clear.

ELIZABETH DAVIS RUBIN (EDR), Adopt a Rescue Pet – No. 2 requiring all organizations to microchip dogs prior to adoption and register the microchip to the adopter to be adopted as part of the local ordinance. I have a problem with that as it contradicts what we can do. No.3 – the rescue organization agrees to reclaim its animals if they are impounded at a local shelter. If it is impounded and the microchip is registered to the adopter, how can we guarantee the local shelter will call us? That needs to be changed to read to the adopting agency or to the adopter so we can be notified. KL – what kind of microchips are you using? EDR uses Home Again and AVID. KL – LVVHS and some of the other groups show the rescue group as primary. EDR – that is what we do but that is not what this says. By registering the microchip to the adopter, the adopter becomes primary not the agency so that needs to be changed to include agency and adopter. KL – what is being said is the person who is adopting the animal needs to have their name on the microchip so you didn't have the problem of trying to go back to the organization. If you do it as primary and secondary, it works really well. EDR – Simply adding the adopting agency and the adopter to that sentence will make it clearer and will stop a lot of rebellion. EDR – No. 4 – rescue groups are not to adopt animals until they are medically fit for surgery and animals must be altered prior to adoption. Or placed into an adoptive home should be added to that. That means AFI cannot display animals that are unsterilized that are up for adoption and adopt them out nor can any of the rescue organizations. KL – you are saying rescue groups are not to adopt animals until they are medically fit for surgery and animals must be altered prior to placement into new home. People can adopt a dog that has not been s/n and they have to wait. That falls under the foster agreement as well as Title 10 says an animal cannot be fostered until it has been s/n. KL – we are saying these are standards and before they can be added to any ordinance, there will have to be public hearings. EDR – I have a comment about No.12. Attend/participate needs to be clarified. Do we have to spend \$250 to attend Best Friends Cat conference or are we going to have a CC community informational conference? KL – believes it is a CC information thing with no fee being charged. We all get together and continue to talk about these issues. We as those organizations are going to get together and continue to talk about these problems. EDR – are you aware of AB60 that is coming up on the State non-profit organizations in this state? KL – that has to do with how you register with the Secretary of State. They are saying to people yes they are a 501C3; this is how you get in touch with these people. They are not just a name out there. EDR – will that be included somewhere in the Gold Standards? An organization has to be registered and not a pending? KL – we will take a look at that. The way Title 10 talks about rescue organizations, it says it must be a 501C3 so that would cover that. If that is the case, you wouldn't have to worry about AB60 because you are already a 501C3. EDR – can it include chapters because we are absorbing five small rescues because of AB60? We now have different breed chapters. KL – that is something we would have to look at once we put it into the ordinance. If you are a 501C3 you don't have any problems. We could add the Ramifications of AB60 for any changes to the definition of a rescue organization should be explored.

JW is confused about where you want to go with this as far as the BCC. Do you want a resolution? Do you want them to go through bits and pieces and create ordinances? I don't understand. KL – we wanted to have the BCC approve the Strategic Plan to End Pet Overpopulation as a policy. This is the County's goal to follow the strategic plan. Everybody has a role in that, whether it is rescue groups, animal control, AFI or the county. AFI said they would commit to saying this is what we are going to do and rescue groups committed to saying this is what we are going to do. The Gold Standards for Rescues came out as a

part of the Strategic plan. The rescues are saying we are committing to certain things and some of these are not anywhere. Some of these like requiring microchips are covered in Title 10 for animals that are adopted by rescue groups. It does it for shelters. JW – in the Strategic Plan, the part about increased proactive measures by Clark County, 1, 2 and 3, NRS tells you what you have to do with the license plate money. This is vague. Section A. 8., I think you mean 7 and it is a work in progress. I don't think you are there yet. It is all over the place that may explain why nothing was done with it before. MP - how do we know for sure these fees are going to s/n? KL – it does state the money from the license plates can go to s/n or to adoptions. If you have smaller counties, they may not have s/n available to them so the money would be used to handle adoptions. MP – how do we know for sure that is happening? KL – the county allocates the money and it goes to one group to provide s/n services. We are pretty sure it does as we are getting the benefit of the s/n. MP – so there is actually something that says this is how much we are paying for s/n? KL – yes.

KL has to listen to comments of JW. She works for a commissioner and these are the people we want to convince that this is the route to take. This is a lot of information. If we don't approve this tonight, we can go back to the humane groups to clarify and take out some of the items already happening. In some instances, we tried to highlight. We were trying to say to the public this is what is being done. This is what the county has committed to. Some of it like the s/n license plates they have already committed to and in addition to that, these are the things we are going to do to deal with pet overpopulation. We are saying this is what the different groups are going to do. We can take some of the stuff out that we know is going to happen or we can make it more specific. My concern is how to do that in the time we have available.

GG are the Gold Standards and Strategic Plan dependent on each other. Can the Gold Plan be recommended to go to the BCC? I envision this going as resolution to the County and having the powers that be adopt this as a Strategic Plan to address this issue. There are some folks that don't acknowledge there is a pet overpopulation. We worked on this a long time and this is something we need to point to as a solution for Clark County and not only have CC entities adopt our plan but go to the other entities also and get all elected officials to adopt it. You cannot address a problem until you admit you have it. If people don't understand it exists, we are never going to be able to fix it. If this is acceptable, I would hope we could get the County to adopt this as resolution and it can always be added to or changed later.

KL with respect to the issue of them being interrelated, some of the Gold Standards are not already in the ordinance and would have to be adopted as part of Title 10. Beyond that, some of the rescues agreed to themselves because they thought it was important and would help deal with the overpopulation problem. The County would not be involved in that. For example, all animals adopted out must receive the core vaccines according to their age. Right now the only thing that is required is rabies. We have expanded that to say that the rescue groups in addition to the rabies must do those core vaccines. DW – the Strategic Plan is more about operating procedures than anything else so changes to the ordinance are more defining things. KL some of this is very specific. For example CCAC, increase enforcement efforts, increase citations for animals not s/n by 15% per year. We have two areas, one is goals to increase proactive measures to reduce animals going into the shelter and to increase proactive measures by CC working with rescue organizations and the other one has to do with increasing public/private partnerships. Area two is to increase the number of animals coming out of the shelter so we are trying to reduce the number of animals going in and increase the number of animals coming out by adoption and return to owner. Those are the two overarching goals. Because some of these are already being done, it may not be clear why we included it but they are an important component. Without providing s/n services, it is hard to mandate s/n.

MP – maybe we can expedite this. In the last 18 months, 30,000 animals have been euthanized so I say we get it to them, let them tell us what is wrong with it and let's go. We have done nothing this year. KL – we can go forward with this, adopt them and I would suggest we adopt both of them and send them to the BCC. It will not go anywhere unless a Commissioner takes it under their wing and decides to present it to

the rest of the Commission. We can recommend adoption of this but I would suggest we make the following changes in Gold Standards for Rescues. Under Item 2, we require all organizations microchip prior to adoptions and register the microchip to the adopter as well as the organization. 4 should read, Rescue groups will not adopt out animals until they are medically fit for surgery and animals must be altered prior to placement in a home. 15 would read the ramifications of AB60 and any changes to a rescue organization should be explored. The Strategic Plan under A 8 we say “based on areas identified in #7” as opposed to #6. This strategic plan only applies to animals currently required to be s/n and microchipped by Title 10. Motion made to accept changes. Motion approved.

**7. Discuss emerging issues and information among Advisory Committee Members; and take appropriate action.**

MD asked if anyone from AFI were present tonight. KL – not tonight. MD wonders how many of the animals were euthanized based solely on a behavioral analysis. He has some animal behaviorists lined up who want to analyze the validity of that; what is it based on? I go there and see animals that are scared. Just like human behavior, I would like to see how this is validated; the behavior study they base some of the euthanasias on. He has not seen the list. Some of the dogs in the kennels are afraid. KL thanks those who spoke at a public hearing and I heard a lot of people say how impressed they were about our student member and her speaking talent. We appreciate everything you have brought to the Committee this year. AV thanks you for the opportunity to be here.

**8. Comments by the General Public**

TERRY PARKS (TP) wanted to comment on what MP said about dogs being recommended for euthanasia. I have been to the bungalows at AFI and have seen dogs be pulled from their adoption kennels for euth because they knocked over their water bowl too much. I have seen it because a dog licks their paws too much. There was an a dog recently in a kennel play area and one of the behavior people came up to them and said “who’s this” and the dog jumped and gave kisses to the behavioral person and the next day the dog was dead because of high energy. I have lists of names of dogs that have been killed for behavior issues that aren’t behavior issues. I am a current volunteer. I have seen it. I have been asked to pull dogs out to help them be taken away to be killed for excuses that are outrageous. I have seen the list. AFI is not transparent about the behavior qualifications. That needs to be looked at. MP – that is the problem. There are no criteria. I have researched this. I want to see this list. I want to see the qualifications. If we treated humans like this, it would be malpractice. I want to see the list.

JANICE RIDONDO (JR) I have had communications with a couple commissioners today and something was brought to our attention. If you read the article in the RJ by John L. Smith, he did an article about Big Cats and yesterday there was an article in the newspaper welcoming four cubs to the Lion Habitat Ranch in Henderson. One of the discussions with the Commissioners was breeding at sanctuaries. We would like to see an item placed on the agenda in the future to discuss breeding licenses. KL – CC started out last year beginning work on an exotic animal ordinance and then we were told that a group was going to work with the legislature and come up with that ordinance. We had one hearing and because they were going to have a state law, we stopped and then it didn’t get out of Committee. JR – it is the exotic animal ordinance that was proposed over 10 years ago and it took something like CJ and Buddy with Buddy dying for a Commissioner to say we have to do something about this. It won’t be talked about again until we have an issue. The owner of that Lion Habitat said on camera that he would be in the same boat as the zoo if he doesn’t get some support. I take offense to that as a 501C3. It isn’t your job to keep my animals fed and if I am breeding them and creating more, I certainly can’t be asking for help. It is separate for any sanctuary, dogs, cats, gerbils, whatever it is. I don’t know how you are a rescue or a sanctuary if you are contributing to the overpopulation. That is how we got here in the first place.

DS – we have hired a new chief and are working on making changes to Title 10 as well as the exotic.

Once he gets in and we start working on it hopefully it will start rolling faster and if it is put on the agenda, I will have more to share with you.

JR – the new chief has been a good friend for a long time. He worked in Comprehensive Planning and knows title 30. I assume he knows Title 10. He worked for the CLV. He is going to be a wonderful chief and hopefully you will see him at the next meeting.

ANOULA WYLDERICH (AW) would like to address the previous speaker's comments regarding AFI. The behavior modification squad is comprised of volunteers. I am one of them. We do not make recommendations to put animals down. We do the opposite. We work with them to get them adopted out. I assume anybody that makes that decision is probably a staff member not the behavior modification team., I attended my first AAC meeting about 3 years ago about a duck that had its legs shirred off at Sunset Lake by a remote controlled boat. The original witness did not want to come forward so I was relaying it secondhand. Shortly after that, the park closed for renovations so nothing was done about that. Recently I was at the lake and I noticed an injured goose. The beginning of October I saw the goose and I talked to park personnel, animal control and NDOW who said they would send a warden to check on it but it would be a few days as it wasn't his scheduled day. I asked what I could do in the meantime and they said I could take it to a vet. Dr. Stefanatos was very familiar with the injury. She had seen many of them, that the damage was irreparable and they do okay in the lake but if they were to go elsewhere they wouldn't fare very well. When I returned the goose to the lake, I noticed at least a dozen other waterfowl with similar injuries. Wings were broken; one had a maimed foot. I have some pictures for you. When I put the goose back I started talking to park visitors and everyone had stories to tell me. I handed out my card and asked them to let me know if they saw anything. During talks I have had with park personnel and park visitors, the problem is consistent and on going. I have been told the boat group has connections; that nothing can be done and that park police basically cleans up the carcasses. I am in the process of getting names, witnesses and more information. A day after I was at the park, I received a call telling me there was a situation that morning. He said there were two of them at the park and they witnessed the boat operators recklessly and intentionally aiming for the ducks which is harassing wildlife. They hit two ducks, killing one. The second one languished with a partially decapitated head. They said they notified Park Police. While waiting for the police, some of the boat operators got very aggressive with them, threatening them, telling them they had connections and there is nothing anybody can do about it. The police aren't going to do anything. The police showed up, put the caller up against the car and ran his I.D. The other person with him took footage on her camera phone. I am waiting for her to contact me so I can view the footage. Unfortunately, I couldn't get either one of them to come tonight. This man told me he visits the park regularly and he hears the boaters bet one another \$20 to see who can hit a duck. They are not following regulations. I don't know if they are renegade operators or part of the collective group that has a permit. In either case, more than one person has told me they go outside the cones, they don't follow the directions, police are never there to ensure the laws are enforced and regulations followed. Everyone I spoke to feels it is a bad combination to have these fast remote controlled boats in the same lake with waterfowl. There is a collision at least once a week. I e-mailed the Assistant Director about the incident when the two ducks were killed. This morning he e-mailed me and said we are definitely enforcing the regulations. I have spoken to the Park Police but there is no report of the incident which I found strange. I am circulating papers at the park and getting names and contact information and they have already filled one page and are ready for another one. The Park Police are acting as a clean up crew, picking up the carcasses and cleaning up the mess and I would like to find out why. This is a wide spread problem at the park. On any given day you will notice the geese and the ducks with the injured wings. We have a dilemma. I have notified Commissioner Scow because that is in her jurisdiction but I did not hear back from her. This upsets visitors and I really don't like what I am hearing.

DS – we don't have jurisdiction over the fowl. If they are injured, it takes NDOW some time. We go if we are needed but it is NDOW that is supposed to handle the ducks. AW spoke with NDOW and they gave me the main office. I spoke with them twice. The first time I called because I knew CCAC couldn't take care of the problem. They told me about the warden going out but it would be a few days. I asked if I

could take the goose to the vet and they are the ones that suggested I go to Animal Kingdom as they are equipped to handle that issue. KL – will talk to NDOW. They just hired people and hopefully we will get some of them in Southern NV. AW thinks the issue should be more preventive than reactive. Maybe we can get the police to patrol more regularly and make sure regulations are followed. MP asked if there were security cameras there. AW does not know of any security cameras there. I have advised people to take footage and photographs if they see the crime in action. MG asked who was in charge of Park Police. DS – Administrative Services. KL – the issue here is that it is an NDOW enforcement issue. That is one of the things we will have to take a look at and think about how we deal with that.

GG – is animal defined as anything non-human? If so that would be defined as willful, malicious animal cruelty. Can CCAC enforce that? To me that is a felony in progress. DS – the ducks and geese are protected under the Department of Wildlife. They are not owned animals but wildlife so NDOW would have to be the one that handles enforcement. GG – if it is a felony in progress, can Metro handle it? DS - Sunset Park falls under the Park Police jurisdiction not Metro. GG would like to see a multi-jurisdiction meeting with animal control from the other agencies possibly at the Regional Planning Committee to see multi-jurisdictional collaboration going on with animal control to do some enforcement together on some of the Craig's list postings, Facebook postings where they are selling animals. I spoke briefly before the meeting with DS about the lost and found issues from the last meeting. Those are still concerns. It happens every day when dogs are lost and people hesitate to take the animal to AFI and that is where the owner will go look for their animal. Should we be adding an Exotics member to this Committee since they seem to be such an issue? I did read John L. Smith's column and I find it interesting that he would take issue with a lot of animal rights people instead of the Assembly of Natural Resources committee that killed that bill. We have representatives that we elect and those people chose not to represent us and allow that bill to not move forward for a hearing.

JW – in response to AW, the Committee might want to consider a future agenda item that Parks and Recreation not allow motorized boats on the lake. If the damage is so much and I understand AW is doing her due diligence to create a paper trail that a recommendation by this Committee to Parks and Recreation via the BCC that motorized boats not be allowed in the Sunset Park lake or any county lakes. KL – thank you for the recommendation. That sound like something we would want to include and we just don't have the NDOW people down here. I will approach them and let them know about the photographs.

KEITH WILLIAMS (KW) as central sponsor for Feral Cat colonies I was invited to speak at the Spring Valley Town Board. An item had come up for someone bringing servals, African Savannah Cats into town for a captive breeding program to produce Savannahs, the offspring of a serval and a domestic cat. The Board recommended against allowing this. My concern is these cats can and have escaped; they have cross-bred with domestic cats and all we need in our feral population is those kind of genes. If that comes before the AAC please consider that. It goes before the BCC on the 6<sup>th</sup> I believe. DW – as a veterinarian, I have to say they are like cats on steroids. Unfortunately, the servals and Savannahs I have seen get relinquished and get rehomed. It is unfortunate that people who are getting them, don't know what they are getting.

TP based on the statement about the behavior modification team, I am also on that team and that consisted of training how to get a scared or vicious animal out of their kennel. We do not make any recommendations for euthanasia. It is not anything that helps with behavior.

## **9. Set date, time and agenda of next meeting**

Next meeting is scheduled for November 14, 2013 at 6:30 pm in the Commission Chambers. Agenda items to be included would be discussion on the boating issue and proposing that we do away with the boats. MG will talk to Parks and Recreation. Ask AFI how they determine rules on behavior issues for euthanasia. DW – AV and I worked independently on the bats coming up with ideas of how to get some

awareness and I outlined a couple ideas. Coming back to who will fund it, how do we man it? Today I had communication with the volunteer organizer for the veterinary component and she had a lot of interest in getting a free rabies clinic going it. Add Bat Awareness issue to agenda. Maybe we will have feedback from the Commission as to whether or not we should relook at Strategic Plan and if so put that on the agenda as well.

## **10. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 8:00 pm